

BEIPC WORKSHOP/MEETING MINUTES
Basin Environmental Improvement Project Commission
November 14, 2007

Coeur d'Alene Inn & Conference Center
414 W. Appleway, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Attendees:

Mr. Terry Harwood (Executive Director)

Commissioners:

Mr. Jon Cantamessa (Chair)

Ms. Elin Miller

Mr. Jack Buell

Ms. Toni Hardesty (Secretary/Treasurer)

Mr. Phillip Cerner

Mr. Grant Pfeifer

Mr. Rich Piazza

Alternates Present:

Ms. Sherry Krulitz

Mr. Curt Fransen

Staff Present:

Ms. Jeri DeLange

Mr. Rob Hanson

Mr. Dave George

Mr. Ed Moreen

Ms. Rebecca Stevens

1) Call to Order and Introductions: The BEIPC Chair, Commissioner Jon Cantamessa (Shoshone County), called the meeting to order followed by the flag salute and introductions. He mentioned that Commissioner Rick Currie (Kootenai County) was unavailable for the BEIPC meeting and introduced Commissioner Rich Piazza as his alternate.

2) Explanation of Workshop Process and Purpose: The Executive Director, Mr. Terry Harwood, gave an overview of the workshop process and purpose. He indicated that it was open to the public and there would be time for public comment in the morning. Then in the afternoon, the BEIPC would engage in discussion in view of the public to focus on ideas and provide direction for the future. Commissioner Cantamessa added that the BEIPC welcomed input from the public. He also noted that the Commissioners needed a workshop session every so often to be able to have an opportunity to discuss items face-to-face.

Mr. Harwood also informed everyone of the draft work plan process and indicated that the work plan would be presented to the BEIPC at today's meeting, but not approved until the February

2008 meeting. He pointed out that the work plan is usually approved by the BEIPC at the November meeting, but that he would use the information gathered from today's workshop to incorporate into the work plan.

3) CCC Comment and Presentation: The CCC Vice-Chair, Mr. Jerry Boyd, presented the CCC comments as the Chair, Mr. John Snider, was unavailable. He said that the first part of the CCC meeting on October 16 covered normal matters including a discussion on the draft work plan, but that the big issue was the East Mission Flats (EMF) repository. Mr. Boyd said that Mr. John Lawson (IDEQ) made a presentation on the status of the EMF 30% design report and then Mr. Ed Moreen (EPA) provided information as well as Mr. Harwood. Afterwards, he noted that there were many questions asked by the public, but that in some cases, there were misunderstandings on the status of the 30% design report, how the repository would operate, and what it would mean to the Cataldo Mission. Several of the main concerns included: 1) the location of the repository relative to the Mission; 2) the historical background and Tribal ancestral area; 3) the visibility of the site from the Mission; and 4) how it may affect the Mission as a State Park. Mr. Boyd suggested that it may help to send out additional information to people or to hold another meeting (or CCC meeting) and the information be presented in a more easily understood manner.

He then brought up other concerns that people living nearby had related to the potential of contaminants leaching into wells and drinking water; and stated that this is a legitimate concern. However, he commented that from his understanding of the EMF presentation, it does not appear that this will happen. Nonetheless, he believed that there would be monitoring wells around the facility and suggested that it may need to be addressed further. Mr. Boyd said that another individual was concerned that children may be able to get into the facility. He suggested that there should be a discussion about security around the location as it is by dredge spoils that are highly contaminated; and that some people feel the area is not secure enough (specifically regarding children). He indicated that the area will be fenced and protected, but that he feels a better explanation is needed of how it would work in the floodway. He remarked that several individuals have seen water go through the area during a flood and that they feel there needs to be better protection, especially while the facility is in operation. He emphasized that as issues come up (and reiterated that some have been addressed, but maybe not enough), that any new questions must be addressed. He asked Mr. Harwood if there were any other issues.

Mr. Harwood mentioned that some people were questioning the property cleanup method, but that the Record of Decision (ROD) went through a lengthy analysis process for the best way to deal with the contaminated yards, commercial areas, and recreation areas in the Upper Basin. He said that after going through this long process with input from the community, scientists, etc., they came up with the preferred alternative to remove the top layer of contaminated material and haul it to the repository to keep it out of the community and the environment. He stated that this has been going on for a number of years. He said that some people had new ideas such as scraping off the contaminated soil and hauling it outside the Superfund area (i.e. Yucca Mt. or the desert), vitrifying (i.e. turning it into glass in place), or using plants that uptake metals. However, he pointed out that the decision on how to clean up the tremendous volume of contaminated sediments was already made in the ROD; and that to go back to try to come up with another remedy would use up all the funding we have for the current remedy. Then, the

community would not be in the process of being cleaned up. Mr. Harwood commented that it's good for people to ask questions and those issues need to be answered, but that it does not deal with the issue of the EMF repository. He also brought up other issues connected with the ROD in regards to the huge volume of contaminated sediments that need to be dealt with for the ecological cleanup that has not even been started yet; and that there needs to be some place to put them where they can be controlled away from the river. Mr. Harwood explained that there are two types of cleanup remedy: 1) human health; and 2) ecological; and that there are two types of cleanup actions: 1) remediation; and 2) removal.

Mr. Boyd indicated that there was another item he wanted to emphasize for the public. He said that there is a repository at Big Creek as well as some other repositories in the Upper Basin, but there is not a repository for the Lower Basin yet except for the EMF site. He pointed out that the EMF repository would be much closer for people along the lower CDA River than going all the way to Big Creek for the ICP. Mr. Harwood explained that under the Institutional Control Program (ICP) that was implemented for the Basin, when you dig a foundation for a garage, etc., then you are required to do certain things such as dispose of any excess material, if contaminated, in a repository. He explained that repository sites encourage people to dispose of contaminated material correctly, but that the Big Creek site would be full in about 4-5 years and new sites need to be located.

Mr. Harwood also brought up that some people were saying that because the EMF repository is in EPA Region 10, that means that people from Oregon and Washington may haul their hazardous waste to the EMF. However, he clarified that this is not correct as hazardous waste is RCRA waste and cannot be placed in a CERCLA repository. Mr. Boyd added that there may be contaminated waste around CDA Lake. Mr. Phillip Cernera (CDA Tribe) suggested that with the controversy over the EMF, that Mr. Ed Moreen (EPA) provide an update.

Mr. Moreen stated that he worked with Mr. John Lawson (IDEQ) on repositories and that Mr. Lawson is the actual lead on repositories for the State of Idaho. He said that IDEQ released the 30% design document in May and took public comment until July. Then, IDEQ released the response to comments in September and posted it to the web. In addition, IDEQ and EPA prepared a fact sheet that was mailed out to many interested people as well as posting it to both of their websites. They have also been working with Mr. Harwood to make an EMF web page available through the Basin Commission website to keep the public informed of new information and also past information. Mr. Moreen indicated that EPA and IDEQ were participants at two recent community meetings regarding issues on the EMF repository: 1) one sponsored by the CCC at the Canyon School; and 2) one sponsored by the St. Pius X Church in CDA to address the concerns of members (over 500) who signed a petition. He remarked that the concerns were very similar at both meetings, but that many of the issues addressed did not seem to be understood by some of the participants. Because of this, he said that they will try to address the problem by posting additional information to the web. IDEQ will continue to work on the design to the 60% level. He noted that the document will be less technical than the 30% design as people wanted to see something simpler to understand. Mr. Moreen also indicated that the repository height will be much shorter than the 30% design (as it favored 65 ft.) and that it will be reduced to 34 ft. as the agencies want to be responsive to concerns about the Mission and the people living in the area.

Commissioner Elin Miller (EPA) commented that the EPA will also be going out with a response letter with IDEQ to specifically answer some of the questions that were highlighted and also to clarify the difference in height. She feels that this will be helpful, but also asked the CCC to continue to assist with funneling the information to the public to help with the process; and that she appreciated it.

Commissioner Jack Buell (Benewah County) questioned why Benewah County people would not be able to use the repository. Mr. Harwood answered that if the material generated under the ICP is within the administrative area of the ICP, then the repository is available. However, he explained that the repository is being constructed under the ROD as a CERCLA action; and noted that in the ROD, the Lake is being treated by other regulatory authorities outside of CERCLA, so you cannot take material outside of CERCLA to the repository. Commissioner Buell inquired about creosote. Mr. Harwood clarified that it was not part of the CERCLA remedy and that it would need to be placed somewhere else; and that it was also not in the ICP administrative boundary. He stressed that these repositories may only receive waste material contaminated by mining and milling operations because their construction falls under the Superfund ROD.

Commissioner Rich Piazza (Kootenai County) brought up the topic of monitoring wells and asked if there would be a baseline established. Rob Hanson (IDEQ) answered that they have installed some shallow wells in the last few weeks at the EMF site and that they are looking at some other places to place deeper wells. He also mentioned that they were trying to gain access to the Asarco site (west of EMF) to sample it as well to help establish baselines.

4) Special Acknowledgement: Mr. Harwood brought up that he wanted to speak about the loss of a very good friend of his (who he used to work with at the Forest Service), Mr. Rob Spafford (former CDA Tribe and CCC member) who recently passed away and was an integral part of the Basin cleanup efforts. He said that Rob had good insight on how to deal with issues and that he greatly appreciated him and will surely miss him. Mr. Cernera said that he greatly appreciated the sentiment and mentioned that there will be a bench and plaque placed on the Trail of the Coeur d'Alenes in Mr. Spafford's memory.

5) Draft 2008 Work Plan and Ideas for BEIPC Future Issues: Mr. Harwood explained that the draft work plan was a skeleton (framework) that would be used by the BEIPC for discussion at the workshop later in the meeting. The TLG Chair, Mr. Kenny Hicks, then made a presentation on the draft work plan. He said that progress on the mine/mill work was slowing down as some of the projects were coming to an end. He brought up human health and ecological issues and mentioned that they had been discussed on recent TLG calls for how they relate to the work plan. In addition, Mr. Hicks mentioned that the Recreation PFT had been reactivated by Mark Masarik (EPA). Regarding human health, he indicated that one of the biggest challenges for blood lead screening had been trying to keep the program running in order to compile information. On environmental remediation issues, he discussed Upper Basin versus Lower Basin for human health and ecological remedies. He said that one concern expressed by the TLG was how far we go with work in the Lower Basin without there being substantial progress in the Upper. Mr. Hicks also raised the issue posed by Mr. Harwood, where do we go from here as the projects come

to an end. He commented that people lose interest as the work declines; and that all of the PFT's are seeing declines in participation. Mr. Hicks suggested that we need to take a look at all of the projects, so that we may spend any remaining CWA funding on them as long as it furthers the goal of environmental cleanup.

On the Lake Management Plan (LMP), Mr. Hicks said that it has been a long process and that he had the opportunity to participate in some of the meetings. His personal opinion is that he believes the parties involved are closer to a LMP than they think they are. He emphasized that it is absolutely vital to have the LMP in place. Mr. Hicks commented that even though not all of the parties can agree on all of the issues, they can agree to move forward.

Then he thanked Mr. Harwood for recognizing the need a few years ago for infrastructure and flood control work in the Upper Basin; and for compiling all of the maps and data for the infrastructure and revitalization plan as well as for flood control. He indicated that this may be one of the Silver Valley's most difficult challenges to get the support from all of the cities and communities as most people in the Silver Valley love the historic registry and quaintness of the region. However, he said that there are a lot of old pipes underground in the towns and that each town sits upgradient from the River. Mr. Hicks explained that the CWA project for the Mullan Sanitary Sewer Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) showed clear reductions in flows and metals loading, but that it will be tough as the EPA and IDEQ are not in the business of replacing infrastructure, or allowing cities to release nutrients and metals into the River. He added that nutrients are not covered in the ROD, but suggested that holistically we need to take a look.

Mr. Harwood then gave a brief overview of how he built the work plan. He mentioned that there are only several CWA projects that are not completed and that he posted the list of final reports to the BEIPC website. For the most part, he mentioned that the CWA projects have resulted in the BEIPC getting a lot of information and good data to use for future work.

Mr. Cernera asked for clarification of the two draft work plans dated 10/26/07 and 11/05/07. Mr. Harwood clarified that he made some changes to the 10/26/07 draft per the USFWS (Mr. Brian Spears) and that the BEIPC would be working from the 11/05/07 draft. Mr. Cernera also asked if there would be a vote on the draft TLG work plan dated 11/05/07. Mr. Harwood responded that he will take input from today's workshop to add to the work plan and that it will be brought to the BEIPC for approval in February 2008.

Mr. Cernera then asked about another item on page 20, under the LMP activity section (paragraph 2 at the end), that talked about a vote that was taken by the BEIPC – that the Basin Commission voted to coordinate and be involved in the LMP and any future modification of the plan in 2004. From his perspective, Mr. Cernera said that he did not believe that was the vote. He believed that it was to adopt whatever the old plan was and that it did not speak to any future modifications of the plan. He asked Mr. Harwood to look back at the motion that was carried. Mr. Harwood replied that this particular statement had been in the plan for years and that he would check into it.

Commissioner Toni Hardesty (IDEQ) asked for clarification on the process for the draft work plan. She asked Mr. Harwood if he was taking input from today and also asked him if he was

seeking written comments from the BEIPC before the February meeting in order to revise the work plan. Mr. Harwood said that if the Commissioners want to provide written input it would be fine, but that he was hoping during the workshop process to discuss various items and reach consensus for some of them. He reiterated that he needs direction for the future.

Break

6) Public Comment Period: Mr. Harwood explained that his assistant, Ms. Jeri DeLange, would write down the general idea of people's comments on the flip chart; and a complete list would be provided later along with the BEIPC's ideas and comments from the workshop discussion. Commissioner Cantamessa added that an hour had been set aside and that the discussion could go longer if necessary. However, he asked people to keep their comments brief at the beginning in order to allow everyone the chance to speak. He asked the public to provide comments and target issues that would be useful for next year's work plan. (***Note: The complete list of notes from the BEIPC staff, public comment, and BEIPC workshop discussion is provided at the end of the minutes.***)

7) Other Discussion: Commissioner Miller asked that the following letter from the EPA and IDEQ be read into the record as it is a response from the questions raised by citizens on the EMF repository at the public meetings:

“Dear Citizen: Thank you for coming to the community meeting in October on the East Mission Flats Repository. We were happy to be invited to speak with you about this project. There are many questions and concerns about this new repository. Time was limited at the meeting. We did not have a chance to explore many issues that were important to some of you. This letter gives you more information.

The need for a repository: Yard cleanups are going on to protect public health. The soil from those cleanups needs a safe place to go. With much of the cleanup ahead of us, we know that there is not enough room in the repositories we have now. Plus, there is no repository in the lower Basin, where yard cleanups are starting. Also, the site is needed to serve the community's new Institutional Controls Program. Residents who do work on their own properties need a nearby place to take their contaminated soils. East Mission Flats will securely contain the cleanup soils. It will help reduce people's exposure to contaminants.

Location: The repository is not located at the Old Mission. It will not affect Mission grounds. The repository is across I-90, away from the Mission. The site will be sculpted and vegetated as it is built. That way, it will blend in with natural surroundings.

34 Feet High: The agencies made a big change to the site design. The design now tops out at 34 feet high, instead of 62 feet high. This change was made in response to public concerns about possibly being able to see the repository from the Mission. This change assumes that an additional repository site will be found. If another site isn't found, then the design may be revisited after a decade or so.

Wetlands: There are wetlands north and west of the site. The repository is being designed to avoid those wetlands. Those wetlands, like all land in this area, are very contaminated.

Floods: This site floods. The agencies have carefully studied this topic. Flood waters in this area generally move slowly and recede quickly. The repository will be designed so that it will not be eroded. It will be engineered and vegetated to be stable. Contamination is widespread in the Coeur d'Alene Basin. It is EPA's policy to site repositories within the "area of contamination." This means that repositories will typically be sited in the floodplain. It is simply not an option to haul the material out of state or to another site.

Won't Harm the Environment: The river is far from the site, and the site will be engineered to keep sediments in place. It will be designed to keep flood waters from carrying contamination away from the site. With the proper management by the State of Idaho for the long term, this site will not have a negative effect on the river. Because this entire area is already very contaminated, placing a cap of clean material over the site will actually reduce contamination in the long term.

Proper Management: The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality will manage this repository very tightly, just as it does at Big Creek Repository. Citizens have voiced concerns about the repository at Page, which is managed by Panhandle Health District as a 24/7 repository. Unauthorized dumping has been noted at Page. Panhandle Health District is taking steps to prevent it from continuing.

Not a Dump: This site will be used for contaminated waste (soil) from local community cleanups and residential cleanups. Hazardous waste and residential garbage won't be accepted. Waste from outside the Coeur d'Alene Basin won't be accepted. The site will be carefully managed over time by the State.

We hope this information is helpful to you. We are committed to being good neighbors while making a safe place to keep contaminants away from citizens. For more information, visit the Basin Commission website at www.basincommission.com. Go to Latest News, then click on East Mission Flats News. One item that might be extra helpful is the Frequently Asked Questions. We would be happy to send you hard copies, as well."

/ s / John Lawson, Project Manager, IDEQ

/ s / Ed Moreen, Project Manager, EPA

Commissioner Miller also explained that the BEIPC is unique; and that some may say that the EPA has more resources going into this Superfund effort than anywhere else. She indicated that she is a fairly new person coming on board with EPA (about 1 year), and that she is spending a lot of time on this issue versus dealing with offshore drilling, mining efforts, the State of Alaska, Hanford, and a few other issues in the Pacific Northwest. She said that she asked herself if it was worth time spending and that the EPA had a lot of discussion about this. At the end of the day, they decided it was worth time spending, but that the effort will only work if we make the BEIPC work for us. Work as agencies, work as counties, and be the opportunity to get input from the public. She emphasized that this was very important to be successful. Commissioner Miller commented that if we are missing the mark as we deal with communication going

forward, then maybe we need to ask the CCC to use some other ways and this opportunity through the BEIPC to reach out and communicate to the public. Mr. Harwood mentioned that he will add the information later to the BEIPC website under "Latest News" in the next week.

Ms. Bonnie Douglas (CCC member) asked about the Wallace Yard; and why if it is not included in the ROD, then why it is in the BEIPC, and part of the ICP. She also asked about the LMP. Mr. Harwood explained that the ICP is in the ROD, and that it's a requirement of the ROD to protect the remedy. He said that the Wallace Yard is a CERCLA removal action; and that the BEIPC has chosen to deal with removal actions within the Basin and also up the North Fork of the CDA River. He added that the infrastructure work was originally not included, but the BEIPC chose later to be involved in it and Phase 2 of the OU-2 work. In regards to the LMP, he responded that it is in the ROD, but not a CERCLA action; so that is why the BEIPC deals with these issues.

Ms. Douglas said that she was concerned about priorities and that is why she asked. Mr. Cernera said that he wanted to follow-up as he differs with Mr. Harwood. He indicated that the ROD defers decision on the Lake, so he believes that the Lake is not in the ROD just because it mentions the Lake in the ROD. He said that the EPA will not do a CERCLA action on the Lake depending upon the outcome of the LMP. Mr. Cernera added that based on the BEIPC MOA, there are several things the BEIPC can do. First, there is implementation of the ROD; also restoration, and/or lake water management quality issues in which the BEIPC has spent CWA funding. He feels that as the BEIPC moves forward and discusses these issues today, it will become clear where the LMP fits, or not fits with the BEIPC. Mr. Harwood replied that it is a confusing issue as Mr. Cernera suggested. He said that some people thought that because there was no CERCLA action on the Lake that the Lake was not part of the Superfund site; and that is the part we need to have people understand. Commissioner Miller reiterated that there is a lot weighing on the success of the LMP.

Commissioner Cantamessa commented that there has been a high level of interest expressed by all of the Commissioners and the agencies or organizations they represent, whether it's strictly part of the ROD, or not part of the ROD. Mr. Harwood added that the removal actions for contaminated sites discussed today all feed into the Basin, whether it is being done under a remedial (Superfund action) or removal action under CERCLA. He stressed that they are all cleanup actions that deal with water quality and environmental quality.

Mr. Moreen said a question was raised during public comment about communication and that he wanted to respond to it. In regards to the signators on the petition against the EMF, he indicated that the EPA sent out a fact sheet to everyone and asked whether they would like to be further involved as members of the CCC, receive copies of the Basin Bulletin, or attend other meetings.

8) Approval of BEIPC Meeting Minutes from August 15, 2007: Commissioner Cantamessa asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes and brought up that on page 7, last paragraph, the name "John" Hollingsworth was incorrect and should be changed to "Jim." Mr. Cernera pointed out that on page 5, second sentence; it should read, going "to" take a CERCLA or Superfund... Mr. Grant Pfeifer (WA Dept. of Ecology) made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. It was seconded by Commissioner Miller and the motion unanimously approved.

Lunch

9) BEIPC Workshop Discussion: Commissioner Cantamessa indicated that the workshop would be an informal discussion by the BEIPC on ideas and issues regarding its goals and future direction. During the workshop, Mr. Harwood and Ms. DeLange provided a list of general notes on the flipchart based on the summary of the BEIPC's comments and discussion. (***Note: The complete list of notes from the BEIPC staff, public comment, and BEIPC workshop discussion is provided at the end of the minutes.***)

10) Mine and Mill Site Work Update: Mr. Bill Adams (EPA) gave an update on mine/mill work. He indicated that work at all of the current priority sites has been completed, except for the Bureau of Mines site in Osburn. Factors for prioritization of the work were: 1) human health and impacts to water quality; and 2) ecological. He said that they have exhausted the list of sites and now the Mine/Mill PFT will need to do an inventory and come up with a new list based more on ecological issues.

11) CWA Project Final Report, Fish Response to Bank Stabilization: It was noted that Ms. Cathy Gridley (USFWS) was not available to make the final report, but that she would be rescheduled in 2008.

12) CWA Project Final Report, Alluvium Sorting Project: Mr. Geoff Harvey (IDEQ) made a presentation on the final report for the alluvium sorting project at the Monarch mine. He explained that alluvium sorting had not been done before as usually all the contaminated material was hauled to a repository, but that this product resulted in a cost savings of \$102,518 as repository costs are one of the most expensive. Mr. Harvey reported that the over-sort material remaining from the sorting process was then put back onto the tailings pile which was capped; and that a new method will be used for monitoring.

13) OU-2 Phase I Remedial Action Assessment: Mr. Nick Zilka (IDEQ) and Ms. Anne Dailey (EPA) gave an update on the Phase I work for the OU-2 remedial action assessment which included: 1) source removal; 2) monitoring for surface and groundwater improvement; 3) evaluation of Phase I actions; and 4) determine if additional actions were needed. Ms. Dailey mentioned that the assessment report will be provided to the Water Quality PFT and will also be tied together with the Basin Environmental Monitoring Plan (BEMP). A summary of the remedial action assessment findings will also be linked to the website.

14) Wallace Rail Yard CERCLA Removal Action Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA): Mr. Moreen and Mr. Zilka made a presentation on the Wallace Yard and Spur Line EE/CA and indicated that public comment will be taken until November 23, 2007. The Response to Comments will be out by January 31, 2008 and the EE/CA finalized. The EPA will issue an action memorandum in February 2008, and the agencies will negotiate a consent decree with the potentially responsible parties (PRPs).

15) Adjourn: Commissioner Cantamessa thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

BEIPC STAFF SUGGESTIONS FOR WORKSHOP

1. FUNDING ISSUES

- a) To enhance Superfund actions
- b) Recreational areas (Recreational PFT restarted)
- c) Historic preservation
- d) Provide a broader-based approach and political backing for the level of support for funding of eco-remedy (i.e. funding influence in D.C.)

2. IRP & FLOOD CONTROL

- a) Help communities coordinate funding sources (IRP report will contain potential funding sources such as grants, etc.)
- b) Coordinate infrastructure improvements and flood control with yard program work if possible

3. CONTAMINANT MANAGEMENT

- a) Direction for Lake and River
- b) Put slack water portion of the Spokane River into the LMP if not dealt with in a contaminant management plan

4. LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN ISSUES

- a) Nutrient loading
- b) Excavation and dredging
- c) Enforcement
- d) Funding

5. WALLACE YARD

- People looking for constructive ways to be part of the process

PUBLIC COMMENT DISCUSSION AT WORKSHOP

1. EMF REPOSITORY

- a) Excavation issues (material was flattened out and area hydro-seeded for winter)
- b) Need to check comments sent by Bonnie Douglas (in August)

2. INFRASTRUCTURE REVITALIZATION

- a) Coordinate efforts
- b) Look at performance based approaches

3. NUTRIENT LOADINGS

- a) Need to address nutrient loading coming from the Silver Valley
- b) Check into nutrient loading from the other side of EMF

4. **WALLACE YARD**
 - Look at performance based approaches
5. **DIRECTION**
 - Suggestion – need to stay focused on cleaning up Silver Valley
6. **ACCOUNTABILITY/FUNDING**
 - a) Local control
 - b) Taxing authority
 - c) Take responsibility
7. **COMMUNICATION**
 - a) Keep public informed
 - b) Increase public attendance at meetings
 - c) How to reach more people?
8. **PUBLIC INTEREST/AWARENESS**
 - a) Present worst case scenario to get people's attention?
 - b) Ideas to create public awareness
 - c) Need to make sense (simplify technical issues for better understanding)
9. **CONTINUE PUBLIC INFORMATION ON EMF**
 - Include the 550 people who commented
10. **NEW METHODS OF CLEAN UP**
 - Look at new technologies
11. **NATURAL ATTENUATION**
12. **DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE**
 - Look at both sides
13. **FUNDING**
14. **RECREATIONAL PFT**
 - Continue with Rec. PFT

BEIPC COMMISSIONERS DISCUSSION AT WORKSHOP

1. **ANNUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS**
 - Summary
2. **COMMUNICATION**
 - a) Identify issues of concern for a more elevated approach

- b) Identify groups of people to get the “word” out
 - c) Use CCC to help
 - d) Focused mailing to reach people without access to newspapers
 - e) How to help people understand technical aspects?
 - f) Develop strategy to keep people engaged in the long-term
 - g) Create Communication PFT
3. **BRAINSTORM ISSUES**
 - Communication (TV, radio, etc.)
 4. **CONSULTANT HELP**
 - Use consultant help with communication (and/or other issues)
 5. **OTHER TOOLS FOR IMPROVEMENT**
 - a) To better convey the information
 - b) For BEIPC commissioners also
 6. **RAISE LEVEL OF AWARENESS OF THE BEIPC**
 - Most unique setup of Superfund cleanup in U.S.
 7. **DEVELOP INVOLVEMENT CATEGORIES**
 8. **BEIPC EDUCATION**
 - Become more informed to educate constituents
 9. **GROUP COMMUNICATION**
 - Better communication among all groups – BEIPC, TLG, CCC, PFTs
 10. **CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES**
 - If controversy anticipated, use higher level of advertising to get information out
 11. **PROVIDE ESTIMATES (IF AVAILABLE)**
 - Important for public to know estimates early
 12. **TLG FEEDBACK**
 - BEIPC commissioners need good feedback from TLG reps
 13. **BEIPC STATEMENT**
 - End of the BEIPC meeting statement
 14. **REPOSITORIES**
 - Important to look at long-term
 15. **POTENTIAL FLOOD EFFECTS**
 - Review effects from flood events on repositories to see if there are any problems

- 16. CITIZEN INPUT ON PFTS**
- 17. COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE**
 - Strong community knowledge base (to better design projects)
- 18. MEET WITH BUSINESSES & COMMUNITY LEADERS TO DISCUSS IDEAS**
- 19. INVESTIGATE POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS FOR COMPROMISES**
- 20. MAKE SURE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND ACTIONS BEING TAKEN**
- 21. NEED MORE REPOSITORY SPACE**
- 22. INVESTIGATE ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS**
- 23. DEVELOP STRATEGIC PLAN**
- 24. FINANCIAL STRATEGY**
 - Potential funding sources
- 25. LIMITATIONS**
 - a) Does public know limitations that agencies have to work under?
 - b) Need to better convey so they understand
- 26. FUNDING FOR ECOLOGICAL ISSUES**
 - EPA not receiving eco-funding (funding priority is for human health)
- 27. NEED TO ELEVATE NEEDS FOR ECO-REMEDY**
- 28. CERCLA FUNDING CANNOT BE AUGMENTED**
- 29. YARD PROGRAM**
 - 6-8 more years for yard program to continue (for human health)
- 30. NATURAL RESOURCES RESTORATION**
 - BEIPC - provide input into restoration projects & help coordinate with Trustees
- 31. REMEDY & RESTORATION**
 - a) Remedy and restoration have to be coordinated
 - b) BEIPC may be able to help look for funding
- 32. FUTURE FUNDING**
 - a) Talk to Congressionals about future funding
 - b) Select projects to seek funding that everyone agrees to
 - c) Prioritize and show commitment

- d) Influence funding
- 33. DEVELOP PROJECTS**
 - Then seek various funding sources
- 34. ENFORCEMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS**
- 35. IMPORTANCE OF TLG**
 - a) Keep group motivated and focused
 - b) Show appreciation of efforts
- 36. SUPPORT RECREATIONAL PFT PROCESS**
 - Rec. PFT restarted
- 37. CLEAN RECREATIONAL AREAS**
 - a) With tourism encouraged, how to deal with providing clean Rec. areas in Basin?
 - b) Who pays?
- 38. LAND SWAPS**
 - Potential land swaps with agencies to develop Rec. areas
- 39. CWA REMAINING FUNDING**
 - A lot has been accomplished through the BEIPC, but almost no funding remains for additional projects
- 40. BEIPC VISION**
 - What will the BEIPC's vision be for the next 5-10 years?
- 41. ECO-REMEDY**
 - Make decision about eco-remedy and try to find funding
- 42. BEIPC DIRECTION**
- 43. LEVERAGE**
 - Use leverage to move forward and influence
- 44. CREATE LIST & PRIORITIZE ROLES**
- 45. BE REALISTIC ABOUT CAPACITIES**
- 46. PARTNERSHIPS**
 - Look at all responsible parties and collectively work together
- 47. BEIPC LEADERSHIP**
- 48. FIELD TRIP**

- Field trip next summer with Congressionals

49. INFRASTRUCTURE – SILVER VALLEY

50. CONTINUE PFTS

- a) Recreational
- b) Blood lead
- c) Repository
- d) Funding